

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-22 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 9-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Chakraborty et al.** (USP 7,110,454) in view of **Toklu et al.** (USP 6,549,643).

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Chakraborty et al.** in view of **Toklu et al.** and in view of **Yilmaz et al.** (Shot Detection Using Principal Coordinate System).

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Chakraborty et al.** in view of **Toklu et al.** and in view of **Yilmaz et al.**

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Chakraborty et al.** in view of **Toklu et al.** and in further view of **Blanchard** (USP 6,347,114).

Claims 15 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Chakraborty et al.** in view of **Toklu et al.** and in further view of **Park et al.** (USP 6,597,738).

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Nakamura et al.** (US 2001/0051516) and in view of **Pan et al.** (US 2002/0080162) in view of **Gonsalves et al.** (US 6,392,710).

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Nakamura et al.** and in view of **Pan et al.** in view of **Gonsalves et al.** and further in view of **Gotoh et al.** (US 5,801,765).

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify aspects of the present invention. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the shot density is calculated per a time unit (i.e., “a calculator for calculating shot density DS of the video *per a time unit* from the respective segmented shots”). Further, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that motion intensity is calculated per unit region on the image (i.e., a calculator for calculating motion intensity *per unit region on the image using a value of motion vectors* of the respective segmented shots”).

It is submitted that none of the cited references disclose or suggest the following features recited in claim 1:

- (1) Shot density DS of the video is calculated per a time unit from the respective segmented shots in the present invention, whereas not in **Chakraborty et al.**
- (2) Motion intensity is calculated per unit region on the image using a value of motion vector of the respective segment shots in the present invention, whereas not in **Chakraborty et al.**
- (3) A plurality of continuous (sequence) shots are classified to a dynamic scene or static scene in the present invention, whereas in **Chakraborty et al.** scene change points are detected in a plurality of continuous shots.

Moreover, the patentability arguments presented in the Request for Reconsideration filed on April 9, 2010 are incorporated herein by reference.

The Examiner is requested to address these arguments with analysis and explanation of the substance of the arguments, and not merely conclusory statements that the cited prior art allegedly discloses the claimed features.

More specifically, throughout the prosecution, applicants have provided an analysis of the teachings of the cited references, particularly **Chakraborty et al.**, and have provided technical reasoning and explanation as to why the references do not disclose or suggest aspects of the claimed invention. However, throughout the prosecution, in response to applicants' arguments, the Examiner has formulaically copied the portion of the claim language argued as not being disclosed by the reference(s), copied large portions of the cited references, and, without further analysis or explanation of the reference, concluded that the portion of the reference reiterated by the Examiner in the Office Action discloses the portion of the claimed invention argued by applicants. The Examiner has basically ignored applicants' technical analysis and reasoning throughout the prosecution of this application.

Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to address each of the applicants' arguments presented in the Request for reconsideration filed on April 9, 2010 by providing analysis and explanation regarding any alleged deficiencies in the technical reasoning supporting these patentability arguments, and not by merely reiterating large portions of the cited reference(s) and simply concluding that those portions teach the claimed features.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection and an indication of allowability of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are issues remaining to be resolved in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite and complete prosecution of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/WILLIAM M. SCHERTLER/

William M. Schertler
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,348
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

WMS/ar